


IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Ashutosh Vyas, et al.	§	Attorney Ref.: 26530.94 / IDR-685
	§	
Serial No.: 10/776,150	§	Customer No. 27683
	§	
Filed: February 11, 2004	§	Group Art Unit: 2164
	§	
For: METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR	§	Examiner: Sathyanarayan R. Pannala
AUTOMATICALLY CREATING	§	
AND UPDATING ACCESS	§	Confirmation No.: 3076
CONTROLS LISTS	§	

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

I hereby certify that this correspondence (including any listed enclosures) is being electronically filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office via the EFS-Web system on October 17, 2007.


Linda Ingram

STATUS REQUEST
AND
INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Office Action mailed on June 6, 2007. The most recent prior Office Action was mailed on March 1, 2007, and presented an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103. On May 1, 2007, Applicants filed a Response to the March 1 Office Action, and the Response presented arguments against the §103 rejection in the March 1 Office Action. The June 6 Office Action presented a §103 obviousness rejection that is identical to the §103 obviousness rejection presented in the March 1 Office Action. MPEP §707.07(f) provides that: "Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it". The June 6


Office Action repeated identically the §103 rejection from the March 1 Office Action, but failed to "take note of the applicant's argument [from the May 1 Response] and answer the substance of it". As a result, the June 6 Office Action did nothing to advance the examination of the present application.

Therefore, on August 21, 2007, the undersigned and Mr. Van Lindberg telephoned the Examiner in order to discuss this problem. The Examiner indicated he would review the situation and call back. The Examiner called back on August 22, but no agreement was reached. The Examiner invited the undersigned and Mr. Lindberg to also discuss the matter with Supervisory Primary Examiner (SPE) Charles Rones. Accordingly, the undersigned contacted SPE Rones, who in turn proposed a telephone interview for August 28. On August 28, the undersigned and Mr. Lindberg discussed the June 6 Office Action with the Examiner and SPE Rones. At the conclusion of that telephone conference, SPE Rones indicated they would consider the matter and call back. On September 4, 2007, SPE Rones left a voice-mail for the undersigned, indicating that the June 6 Office Action is being withdrawn, and that Examiner Pannala will issue a replacement Office Action answering the substance of the arguments presented in Applicants' May 1 Response.

To date, Applicants have not received the replacement Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants are filing this Status Request and Interview Summary in order to document the telephone conferences with Examiners Pannala and Rones, to confirm Applicants' understanding that the June 6 Office Action has been withdrawn, and to inquire about the status of the replacement Office Action.

More specifically, it is Applicants' understanding (1) that the Office Action mailed on June 6, 2007 has been withdrawn, and (2) that Applicants are not currently subject to any obligation to take action. Further, Applicants respectfully inquire about the status of the replacement Office Action, and in particular request notice of when the replacement Office Action will be mailed.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Murray Smith
Registration No. 30,222
(972) 739-8647

Date: October 17, 2007

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: (972) 739-6900
Facsimile: (214) 200-0853
File: 26530.94

Enclosures: None

R-179103.1